

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 275

Response ID 5675330

Date of contribution Apr 28 24 11:08:10 am

Personal information

First name Pene

Last name Burton Bell

I'm providing a submission (choose one): as an individual

Please let us know what ward you live in Waikanae

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May? No

Are you happy for your name to be published with your feedback: My name can be published with my feedback

Submission

Proposal 1: Three waters funding
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

It isn't fair to expect future generations to pay debts that need to be paid now, even if they will benefit from the infrastructure which results. It is our cost, we need to meet it, and we need to not increase it for future ratepayers who will then be paying interest as well.

Proposal 2: Proactively reduce Council's debt
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Apply average rates increases of 8% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

It isn't fair to expect future generations to pay debts that need to be paid now, even if they will benefit from the infrastructure which results. It is our cost, we need to meet it, and we need to not increase it for future ratepayers who will then be paying interest as well.

However, the idea of not allowing the employment of any more staff is dumb as a blanket decision. Staffing decisions need to be made on a case by case basis just as budget decisions should be. Similarly, there is a lot council is responsible for that wouldn't be classified as infrastructure. Saying KCDC will not spend outside of key infrastructure is looking to be absolved of responsibilities the council has. I do not accept that - if we need to spend money outside of key infrastructure it should be spent, even if this means rates cannot be kept as low as hoped.

Proposal 3: Transfer Council's housing for older people Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Transfer our older persons' housing assets to a new Community Housing Provider

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

Managing housing for our poorest and most vulnerable is not core to Council's business, and the extra resources required to manage this role do not need to exist within council, central government and other agencies (including some NFPs) will be much more effective at managing this role, and this will also mean less confusion for those applying for support, and those assessing such applications.

New climate action rate

Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 2: Make no change to how we allocate funding our climate change activities

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?

'Nice idea' but from what I read of it, the climate action rate would be very focussed on adaptation infrastructure and this would squeeze out funding for mitigation in other forms. I object to paying for seawalls for residents who knew this was going to be a problem when they bought their properties. The first IPCC report advertising this was released in 1990, 40 years ago, so it certainly shouldn't be any surprise. By taxing all residents in the district equally (based on capital value) the council will be encouraging more people to build and buy in flood/inundation areas. This is unwise and unfair. Council knows which properties are prone, on maps I'm sure, any climate action rate should have some bias to see those properties pay more for the infrastructure to protect them.

Council should also consider the way central government flipflops on climate funding - if funds are ringfenced it is really easy for them to see where council proposes to fund initiatives with a climate response focus, and to try and direct those funds where they see fit (not necessarily what council wants to spend it on), or to refuse support because they can see a 'pot of money'.

If you have any views on these policies, please comment here:

Re significance and engagement policy. I see consultations come out for play areas but not so much for the parks and reserves that don't contain active play (eg playgrounds and playing fields). Citizens deserve the opportunity to comment on the development and management of these spaces as much as other spaces.

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about this LTP?

I was disappointed to see about the only mention of environment was in the context of climate response. This is such a small view and doesn't value the over 600ha of council parks and reserves which make up so much of our local environment. These have benefits in terms of climate through ecosystem services. The value of forests to New Zealand in terms of ecosystem services in 2012 was estimated by Landcare Research (https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/assets/Publications/Ecosystem-services-in-New-Zealand/3_2_Patterson.pdf) to be \$45 billion - huge! These parks and reserves need to be adequately funded and maintained, and this includes for pest (<https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/resources/climate-change-and-introduced-browsers>) and weed control. No mention of any of these areas in the LTP even. I believe more resourcing and funding should be set aside for biodiversity, and as the linked reports show this will have a positive climate impact too.